Application/Control Number: 09/942,818
Art Unit: 2675

Docket No.: PALM-3693

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested. By this amendment, claims 5, 7, 20 and 24 remain pending, claims 4, 19, 21, 22 and 25-27 are newly canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 28 and 28 are newly added.

Rejection of Claims 4, 5, 7, 19, 20, 21 and 24-26

On page 2 of the non-Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4, 5, 7, 19, 20, 21 and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,418,325 to Reber et al. ("Reber") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,466,202 to Suso et al. ("Suso") and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0151283 to Pallakoff. Applicant submits that claims 4, 19, 21, 25 and 26 were canceled without prejudice or disclaimer thereby making the rejection moot with respect to these claims. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 4, 19, 21, 25 and 26 be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection with respect to claims 5, 7, 20 and 24.

Claim 5 is directed to a method for displaying information. The method includes, among other things, displaying computer generated information on a first display screen unit in response to a signal for turning off a second display screen unit. On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner admitted that Reber and Suso do not directly illustrate turning off a second display screen unit and displaying information on a first display screen unit. The Examiner relied on Pallakoff, at paragraphs [0011] and [0015], to disclose or suggest this feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner.

Pallakoff, at paragraph [0011], discloses:

> Device designers can choose to use the direct-view display as the primary display for many smart-phone functions, including instant messaging, email, phone dialing, contact management, schedule management, calculator functions, and the

> like, and to use the microdisplay as a high resolution viewer coordinated with the direct-view display.

Thus, Pallakoff discloses that device designers may choose to use a first display for some functions and a second display, coordinated with the first display, for other functions.

Pallakoff, at paragraph [0015], discloses:

> As a result, this invention enables better ergonomics and better power-consumption characteristics than previous designs for many types of microdisplay-enhanced devices. With this invention, a user can choose to briefly observe a large area of content displayed on the microdisplay, and quickly skim the large area of content to identify a region of interest where they want to focus attention--and then (if they want) they can bring the device to arms'-length to view and interact with that region of interest on the direct-view display. By allowing the user to view a large area of content on the microdisplay, users can quickly orient themselves and quickly skim the large area of content to find a specific region of interest--just as they do on desktop monitors. This is something users cannot do on the small direct-view displays available on pocket-sized phones, PDAs, and hand-held computers that do not include embedded or attached microdisplays. Then, by allowing users to move the region of interest on the direct-view display held at arms'-length, users can choose to do most of their reading, typing, and other interacting with content while holding the device at arms'-length (i.e. normal reading distance). Being able to frequently operate the device and interact with Web pages and other content while holding the device at arms'-length is more comfortable for many people than having to hold a device near-to-eye for long periods. And it is much easier to type text on a device held at arms'-length than a device held near-to-eye. In addition, when the user is not holding the device near-to-eye, the microdisplay can be turned off or idled, saving power--so devices that use this invention can use significantly less power than devices that leave microdisplays on continuously. Similarly, when the user is holding the device near-to-eye, direct-view displays on the device can be turned off or dimmed or idled, saving power.

Thus, Pallakoff discloses that when a user holds the device near his eye, a direct-view display may be turned off and when the user does not hold the device near his eye, a microdisplay may be turned off. However, Pallakoff, as well as Reber and Suso, are completely silent regarding a disclosure or suggestion of displaying computer generated information on a first display screen unit in response to a signal for turning off a second display screen unit, as required by claim 5.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant submits that claim 5 is patentable over Reber, Suso and Pallakoff and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn.

Claim 7 is directed to a method for displaying information. The method includes, among other things, sending information for a clock display to a first display unit automatically in response to a signal for turning off a second display screen unit. On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner relied on Pallakoff, at Fig. 6, to show displaying clock information. However, Pallakoff, as well as Reber and Suso, are completely silent regarding a disclosure or suggestion of sending information for a clock display to a first display unit automatically in response to a signal for turning off a second display screen unit, as required by claim 7.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant submits that claim 7 is patentable over Reber, Suso and Pallakoff and respectfully requests the rejection of claim 7 be withdrawn.

Claim 20 is directed to a hand held computer system that includes, among other things, a first display screen unit and a second display screen unit, where the first display screen unit is configured to turn on automatically in response to a signal turning off the second display screen unit. The Examiner relied on Pallakoff, at paragraph [0015] to disclose or suggest this feature.

For reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claim 5, Pallakoff, as well as Reber and Suso, are completely devoid of any disclosure or suggestion of a first display screen unit and a second display screen unit, where the first display screen unit is configured to turn on automatically in response to a signal turning off the second display screen unit, as required by claim 20. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 20 be withdrawn.

Claim 24 is directed to a method for displaying information in a hand held computer system. The method includes, among other things, in response to an event, displaying computer generated information on a second display screen region identified by permanent printing therein, wherein the displaying computer generated information does not interfere with

displaying program information on a main display screen region, the event is an incoming phone call, and the computer generated information is a dialog enabling receipt of a phone call.

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner relied on Reber, at Fig. 2, item 72, Fig. 4, item 116, and col.8, line 24, "to answer an incoming telephone call" to disclose or suggest this feature. Applicant disagrees.

Fig. 2, item 72, of Reber discloses an icon for initiating a phone book command (See Reber at col. 7, lines 20-24).

Reber, at col. 8, lines 17-26, with reference to Fig. 4, discloses:

> The first input device 12 has a telephone icon 116 associated therewith to indicate its function as a telephone mode button. In the telephone mode, the end user can enter telephone commands by touching the indicated portions of the touchpad 10. In this way, the end user can use the handheld device to dial a phone number to initiate a telephone call, or to answer an incoming telephone call. Thereafter, the end user can verbally communicate with another party using the audio input device 22 and the audio output device 24.

Thus, Reber discloses an icon for indicating telephone mode so that a user may initiate a telephone call or answer a telephone call. However, Reber, as well as Suso and Pallakoff are completely void of any disclosure or suggestion of, in response to an event, displaying computer generated information on a second display screen region identified by permanent printing therein, wherein the displaying computer generated information does not interfere with displaying program information on a main display screen region, the event is an incoming phone call, and the computer generated information is a dialog enabling receipt of a phone call, as required by claim 24. The references do not disclose or suggest using a dialog to enable receipt of a phone call.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 24 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 22

Application/Control Number: 09/942,818
Art Unit: 2675

Docket No.: PALM-3693

On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Reber, Suso and Pallakoff in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0058529 to Horie et al. ("Horie"). Applicant submits that claim 22 was canceled without prejudice or disclaimer thereby making the rejection moot. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 22 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 27

On page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Reber, Suso and Pallakoff in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,552,719 to Lui et al. ("Lui"). Applicant submits that claim 27 was canceled without prejudice or disclaimer thereby making the rejection moot. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 27 be withdrawn.

New Claims 28 and 29

Newly added claim 28 and 28 depend from claim 5 and 20, respectively, and are patentable for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claims 5 and 20.

Application/Control Number: 09/942,818
Art Unit: 2675

Docket No.: PALM-3693

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all rejections, Applicant respectfully submits that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Monday, June 13, 2005

By: /Richard C. Irving/

Correspondence Address:
Cust. No. 49632
Berry & Associates, P.C.
9255 Sunset Boulevard, Suite 810
Los Angeles, CA 90069
Phone: (310) 247-2860
Fax: (310) 247-2864

Richard C. Irving
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,499
Phone: 410-414-3056